DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 043 SP 040 603

AUTHOR Richards, Janet C.
TITLE What Do Teachers and Their Students Think and Know about Reading? An Exploratory Study.
PUB DATE 2001-07-01
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the European Conference on Reading (12th, Dublin, Ireland, July 1-4, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Computer Uses in Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Strategies; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Mississippi; Teacher Knowledge

ABSTRACT

This study examined teachers' beliefs and knowledge about reading, their reading pedagogy, and their students' conceptions of reading. Participants were 24 elementary and secondary teachers and 144 of their students. All participants completed individual interviews and the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile. Results indicated that only two teachers were members of the International Reading Association. School district-mandated reading programs had a strong impact on teachers' beliefs about reading and reading instruction. There were glaring gaps and inconsistencies in teachers' knowledge about reading instruction. For example, although teachers taught vocabulary and sequencing and relied on discussion questions offered at the end of stories, only one teacher mentioned reading comprehension strategies. Teachers tended to equate teaching reading comprehension with testing. Most students said they would ask their teacher or peers for help rather than using specific reading comprehension strategies to aid comprehension. Teachers did not mention culturally responsive teaching. Only 4 teachers mentioned reading discussion groups, and all 144 students reported having no book clubs in their schools. Teachers did not mention a daily reading-writing connection. Only one teacher mentioned computer technology, though most students had considerable computer knowledge. Many teachers were unable to clearly explain their beliefs about literacy teaching and learning. (Contains 49 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Janet C. Richards

1

ED 464 043

What Do Teachers and Their Students Think and Know about Reading?: An Exploratory Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Janet C. Richards, Ph. D.
Professor of Literacy
University of Southern Mississippi
730 East Beach Blvd.
Long Beach, MS 39560, USA
E-mail: janetusm@aol.com

Paper presented at the 12th European Conference on Reading, Dublin, Ireland, July, 2001

SP040603

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What Do Teachers and Their Students Think and Know about Reading?: An Exploratory Study

Researcher's Question: *"If your teacher could teach reading in any way, how would you want to be taught?"*
Sixth Grade Student's Response: *"My favorite thing is when we get to read by ourselves and we get to read anything we want to read."*

Researcher's Question: *"If you could teach reading in any way, how would you teach it and why?*
Kindergarten Teacher's Response: *"Ah ... I strongly, strongly feel that any reading program should have a strong phonemic awareness that focuses on developing a conscious perception of sounds of language. Young children can detect these sounds with ease. Phonemic awareness must be done one step at a time, with each progressive step building upon practice and prior training."*

Researcher's Question: *"How do you teach reading to students who are experiencing difficulty?"*
Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grade Remedial Reading Teacher's Response: *"Ah, that's the great part about Project Read. All of my students are having difficulty...um comprehending, or reading, or with phonology, and the techniques I use help them catch up."*

Researchers' Question: *"What do you think reading is?"*
Third Grade Student's Response:*" Saying words that are sometimes easy and sometimes difficult."*

Researcher's Question: *"What do you know about multiple literacies?"*
First Grade Teacher's Response: *"Um...nothing."*

Researcher's Question: *What do you know about computers?"*
Seventh Grade Student's Response: *"I know everything about computers. You can do everything on computers. You learn from them. You can type and play games on them. You can download stuff."*

Many interacting variables affect students' comprehension processes and their conceptions of reading. Factors include home environment and family expectations for children's achievement (Gipe, 2002), socioeconomic level, physical, cognitive, and psychological dimensions (Rudell, Rudell, & Singer, 1994); prior knowledge; linguistic competence; decoding proficiencies and

phonological awareness (Goswami, 2000; Rudell, Rudell, & Singer, 1994); gender (Christian-Smith, 1993); the match between students' culture and school expectations (Au, 1997); first language (Garcia, 2000), interests (Monson & Sebesta, 1991); motivation (Guthrie & Also, 1997; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000); and attitudes (McKenna, Kear, & Elsworth, 1995).

Not surprisingly, classroom teachers have a direct influence on students' reading comprehension and perceptions about reading (Grossman, 1991; Richards, 1985; Zancanella, 1991). Teachers' beliefs about reading (DeFord, 1979), knowledge about the reading process, questioning techniques, instructional programs, teaching materials, and the learning atmosphere they create all have the potential to directly affect students' reading development (Baumann, Hoffman, Moon, & Duffy-Hester, 1998; Guthrie, Schafer, Wang, & Afflerbach, 1995; Turner, 1995).

Considerable research has explored various aspects of teachers' reading instruction and numerous studies have examined discrete variables associated with students' reading achievement (see Kamil, Mosenthal, Pearson, & Barr, 2000). However, few inquiries have explored the relationship between what teachers think and know about reading, their reading pedagogy, and their students' conceptions of reading. If teachers' instruction has the capacity to impact students' reading achievement and ideas about reading, it is important to explore this connection. This exploratory study investigates teachers' beliefs and knowledge about reading, their reading pedagogy, and their students' conceptions of reading.

The Study

Study Participants and Survey Instruments

Twenty-four elementary, middle, and high schools teachers in south Mississippi and six students in each of their classes participated in the project (N = 144 students). All study participants volunteered for the project. The inquiry was part of program requirements for a cohort of eight graduate educational administration students matriculating in a required course entitled, 'Supervision of School Reading Programs'.

With my guidance, the educational administration students devised the open-ended questions on the teacher and student surveys (12 questions on each survey) (see Appendices A and B for the surveys, and examples of study participants' responses to the survey questions). The educational administration students collected the survey information by individually interviewing the teachers and students using the preestablished questions on the surveys, tape recording participants' responses, and transcribing the data. They also asked each teacher to complete the DeFord (1979) *Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP)*, a self-reporting 28 item, forced-response instrument that provides a general indicator of a teacher's phonics, skills, or whole language orientation.[1]

[1] A phonics orientation posits that reading skill is best achieved by initially focusing on smaller-than-word units, such as letters, groups of letters, and dissected portions of words (Richards, 1985). Teachers holding a phonics orientation place instructional emphasis on the introduction of alphabet letters and sounds.

A skills perspective presumes that reading is best developed by focusing on basic word units (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974), and word identification techniques, such as identification of root words, affixes, and syllabication. Teachers holding a skills orientation usually teach basic sight words and emphasize word recognition.

A whole language orientation is a view of reading which posits that the ultimate goal of reading is comprehension. A teacher with a whole language orientation encourages students to read silently. "Word analysis skills and vocabulary development, while not unimportant, are presented by teachers so that they are not subordinate to reading as a meaning-getting process" (Harste, Strickler, & Fay, 1976, p. 22).

Conceptual Framework for the Inquiry

Two literatures informed the inquiry: 1) A sociocognitive/sociocultural process model of reading that takes a constructivist view of the reading process, suggests that the reader, the text, the teacher, and the classroom community are all involved in readers' constructions of meaning (Alvermann, 2000; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Green, Dixon, Lin, Florian, & Bradley, with Parton, Mattern, & Bergamo, 1994; Richardson, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991) and; 2) a perspective that links teachers' implicit and explicit beliefs regarding reading with their actual reading instruction (DeFord, 1979; Richards, 1985).

Questions Guiding the Research

In my inquiry, I sought to answer the following questions:

1) What reading orientations do the teachers hold?
2) What knowledge base do the teachers have about reading?
3) How do teachers teach reading comprehension?
4) How do teachers assess their students' reading comprehension?
5) What do teachers' know about multiple literacies?
6) What do students think about the reading process?
7) Are students knowledgeable about computer technology literacy?
8) What opinions do students have regarding how reading should be taught?

Analyzing the Survey Responses and the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (DeFord, 1979)

Following guidelines of content analysis, I carefully scrutinized the teachers' and students' responses to the open-ended survey questions (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). I read and reread the data, looking for distinct categories of meaning. As

common patterns became evident, I made notes and underlined what I considered to be salient information (Gay, 1997).

Next, I categorized and labeled the themed topics that appeared in each of the teachers' and students' surveys. I scored the teachers' responses to the *Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile* (DeFord, 1979) following guidelines proposed by DeFord.

Major Themes Emerging from the Inquiry

Analysis of the teachers' responses on the *Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile* (De Ford, 1979) revealed that 9 teachers held a phonics orientation and 15 teachers held a skills orientation.

Analysis of the teachers' responses to the 12 survey questions revealed the following 20 themes:

1) Two teachers out of 24 were members of the International Reading Association and one teacher was a member of a local reading organization. These three teachers were very appreciative of the benefits of such membership. For example, one teacher responded, "Yes, I belong to the International Reading Association. It provides information on the latest books available to teachers and students. I love going to the conventions and picking up tips from authors, curricula, and presenters on teaching and learning."

2) The two teachers who were members of the International Reading Association indicated that, "Reading comprehension is the ability to understand what is read."

3) The two teachers who were members of the International Reading

Association were familiar with the term, 'multiple literacies', and indicated that "multiple literacies includes all art forms, such as, music, literature, performing arts, dance, and drama."

4) The two teachers who were members of the International Reading Association assessed their students' reading comprehension through teacher observation and examinations.

5) Four teachers who were not members of the International Reading Association assessed their students' reading comprehension through discussion groups, reading response journals, and students' retellings of stories. One of these teachers was a member of a local reading organization.

6) Twenty-two teachers in the study were influenced by school district mandated reading programs (e.g., Project Read, STAR, Open Court, Reading Renaissance, Success Bound).

7) Two teachers did not follow any specific reading program.

8) Teachers tended to respond to some of the survey questions using vague terminology and jargon. For example, in response to the question, "How do you teach comprehension?", an instructional specialist replied, "Teachers should stress skill sheets...reading skill sheets. They should start off with picture comprehension and lead 'em up to the printed page. And...um...I think it should be done sequentially and ...um...I think it should be also multi-faceted, that it's not just limited to one...you know, one measure for it."

9) The majority of teachers offered whole class reading instruction.

10) Teachers tended to teach reading to gifted and struggling readers using

similar methods. For example, a third grade teacher responded, "I teach reading to my struggling readers as I do all my students. The main difference is an increase in discussion for gifted students and direct teacher-student assistance for struggling readers."

11) The majority of teachers preferred to teach reading in extended language arts blocks not currently scheduled in their schools.

12) The majority of teachers equated teaching reading comprehension with testing. For example, many teachers responded, "I teach reading through questioning."

13) Twenty-three teachers did not mention reading comprehension strategies and one teacher mentioned K-W-L (Ogle, 1986).

14) Twenty teachers did not mention reading discussion groups and all twenty-four teachers did not mention book clubs, the instructional reciprocity of the reading-writing connection, or culturally responsive teaching.

15) The majority of teachers supplemented their reading instruction programs with trade books, newspapers, magazines, dictionaries, and encyclopedias.

16) Only one teacher mentioned that she used computer technology in addition to her reading program.

17) The majority of teachers responded that intensive phonics instruction was important to students' reading success.

18) Only one teacher reported that she read daily to her students.

19) Most teachers offered currently accepted definitions of reading comprehension (see responses to Question #1 on the Teacher Survey, Appendix A).

20). Teachers responded that they taught vocabulary and sequencing, and relied on the discussion questions presented at the end of stories.

Analysis of the students' responses to the 12 survey questions revealed the following six themes:

1) The majority of students had considerable computer experience and expertise. For example, one students responded, "You can do all kinds of stuff on them. You can sketch and look up information."

2) Only four students responded that they reread a passage if they did not understand it. The majority responded that they would seek help from others. For example, "I ask the teacher if I don't understand."; "I ask somebody."; "I ask my friends for help."

3) The majority of students wished that their teachers would offer varied types of reading instruction that included, books on tapes, games, dramatic enactments, reading books of their choice, teacher reading aloud to the class, making reading fun and simple, individualized reading, grouping for instruction rather than whole class instruction, reading good books, reading long books, using computers.

4) The majority of students had unclear and inappropriate conceptions about reading. For example, in response to the question, "What do you think reading

is?", some students responded, " Mmmm.. it's like you read to learn stuff."; "You read a paragraph or a story and then you answer questions on it or write essays."; It is a subject."; "When we go like, 'a','a', and 'b', 'b', and stuff like that."; "When you memorize it."

5) The majority of students considered themselves to be good readers.

6) No student mentioned utilizing reading comprehension strategies.

Limitations of the Study

As with all research efforts, limitations of this exploratory study must be addressed. First, the number of teacher participants in the inquiry is too low to make broad assumptions. Generalizations to other teachers in other teaching circumstances are not possible.

Second, only six students in each participating teacher's class answered the survey questions. A possibility exists that other students in the teachers' classes might have answered the survey questions differently.

Third, data were collected only through surveys. Use of surveys that provide structured, systematic information has a long history in educational research (Grant & Fine, 1992) however, the data were not triangulated. Neither my graduate educational administration students nor I observed teachers' reading lessons. Therefore, only a single lens provides insights about the 24 teachers' and 144 students' opinions, beliefs, and understandings about reading.

Fourth, the educational administration students were not trained in data collection methods. We cannot take for granted that all of the teachers and students were queried in a standardized way.

Discussion

Despite limitations of this exploratory inquiry, the study contributes considerable insights into the 24 teachers' and 144 students' perceptions and understandings about reading. The discovery that only two teachers in the study were members of the International Reading Association and only one teacher was a member of a local reading organization is troubling. Membership in professional organizations has considerable potential to enhance teachers' knowledge and pedagogy. For example, the two teachers in this study who were members of the International Reading Association were the only teachers who recognized the term 'multiple literacies'. Teachers who hold membership in local and international reading groups take responsibility for their on-going development as scholars, mentors, learners, and researchers (see Routman, 1999).

The inquiry also highlighted the strong impact of school district mandated reading programs on teachers' beliefs about reading and their reading instruction. Experts note that "teachers' instruction should be determined by a teacher's professional judgement and not by a published program" (Routman, 1999 in Au, 201, p. 759). It is imperative that school district administrators along with a cadre of teachers carefully contemplate the value and instructional focus of the particular reading programs they purchase, and determine if these packaged

programs align with current ideas and understandings about good reading instruction. School districts also might consider the advantages of providing research-based reading in-service sessions for teachers rather than spending district money on commercial programs. Further, they might listen to students' ideas about good reading instruction. The students in this survey offered a variety of effective ways they thought reading should be taught.

The powerful impact of packaged reading programs on teachers' beliefs and pedagogy also has import for teacher education and raises considerable questions. Are teacher educators aware of the specific dimensions of commercial reading programs used in the schools in the surrounding communities? Are graduates of teacher education programs fully prepared to teach effective reading lessons? If teacher candidates are prepared to teach reading and have a strong theoretical foundation concerning the reading process, why does it appear that mandated school district reading programs exert such strong influences on teachers' perceptions about reading and their pedagogy? Are teachers' theoretical orientations to reading impacted considerably by school reading programs, or do teachers hold these orientations prior to graduating from schools of education? Research indicates that schools exert considerable influence on teachers' reading instruction (Zancanella, 1991). Reading methods courses have been cited as the least influential source of teachers' beliefs about reading (Hoffman & Kugle, 1981; Richards, 1985). In fact, prior beliefs about reading may be well established before preservice teachers enter reading methods courses (Richardson, 1996)

The inquiry pinpointed some glaring gaps and disheartening inconsistencies in the teachers' knowledge about reading instruction. For example, although teachers responded that they taught vocabulary and sequencing, and relied on discussion questions offered at the end of stories, 23 out of 24 teachers did not mention reading comprehension strategies. Rather, they equated exemplary reading lessons with discrete skills or systematic phonics instruction. In all probability, the teachers' reliance on skills and phonics lessons is mediated by their theoretical orientations to reading (DeFord, 1979), the direct influence of commercial reading programs on their pedagogy, and their own reading instructional histories (Richardson, 1996).

Despite the current back-to basics reading instruction movement in the United States, many experts discount systematic phonics instruction. Coles (2000) found no evidence that phonics instruction in kindergarten lead to increased reading achievement as students advanced through school. Routman believes that effective teachers use a variety of instructional methods for teaching reading and concludes that knowledgeable teachers offer phonics instruction within the context of a literary framework "without using a scripted, packaged program" (Routman, 1999, in Au, 2001) (also see Strauss, 2001).

Teachers also tended to equate teaching reading comprehension with testing. Current ideas about reading suggest that effective teachers teach reading by promoting students' use of self regulated comprehension strategies and focusing on meaning as well as decoding skills (Pressley, 2000). Good teachers help students understand that good readers are strategic, active, and purposeful

(Blachowicz & Ogle, 2001) and that reading is a process of gaining information or expanding one's knowledge (Gipe, 1998). Exemplary reading teachers teach students to monitor their comprehension and take corrective action when necessary, such as rereading a portion of the text or determining what word might make sense in a particular context Yet, the majority of students surveyed responded that if they did not understand what they had read, they would ask their teacher or peers for help. Not one student indicated that they applied specific reading comprehension strategies to aid comprehension.

Another concern illuminated by the study is that teachers did not mention culturally responsive teaching, The importance of cultural responsiveness to students' reading achievement is well recognized (Au & Kawakami, 1994). Further, only four teachers mentioned reading discussion groups, and all 144 students reported that there were no book clubs in their schools. There is considerable qualitative and quantitative evidence that book club formats and literature discussion groups enhance students' comprehension of text and their attitudes about reading (Almasi, 1995; Morrow & Gambrell, 2000). Teachers also did not mention the reading/writing connection. The idea that "daily writing promotes and enhances reading" (Dionisio, 1989, p. 747) is well established.

Most teachers responded that they taught gifted and struggling readers in the same way and preferred whole group instruction. Yet, differentiation of instruction and reduction in instructional group size are related to increased reading achievement (Galda & Cullinan, 1991; Morrow & Smith, 1990). Exemplary teachers use a variety of group structures, strategies, and activities

based upon their students' individualized needs and interests (Routman, 1999).

Only one teacher mentioned computer technology, although the majority of students in the study indicated that they had considerable knowledge about computers. Since technology has expanded the ways we learn and communicate and since "today's students are literally growing up in front of computer screens" (Alexander & Jetton, 2000, p. 296), it is imperative for teachers to recognize the potential that computer technology offers.

A final disturbing note is that many teachers responded to some of the survey questions using jargon and vague descriptions. Exemplary teachers can explain their beliefs about the teaching and learning of literacy. They can clearly communicate why they teach in certain ways and what theories support their practices. Routman refers to this knowledge as being able to communicate the why, what, and how of teaching (1999).

Questions that Remain Unanswered

The most important contribution of this exploratory study may lie in the questions that remain unanswered. Is it possible that the structured survey restricted the teachers' responses to the extent that they did not mention diverse aspects of their reading instruction that support current theoretical perspectives about reading? Might the teachers in this study have articulated a deeper knowledge base and shared more comprehensive descriptions of their reading programs if different qualitative and quantitative data collection methods were employed? Are teachers aware that they are significantly influenced by their

beliefs about reading and the commercial reading programs mandated by their school districts? Are teachers motivated to enhance and extend their practices, but feel constrained by their school district guidelines for reading instruction? Why do school district leaders want teachers to use packaged reading programs? Investigating these types of questions has the potential to enhance students' reading instruction and development by promoting congruence among teachers' and administrators' conceptions and understanding about good reading pedagogy and extending their insights about the reading process.

Summary and Implications for Teacher Education, School Districts, and Teachers

In summary, it is important to remember that this study surveyed only 24 teachers and 144 students in a specific geographical location. In addition, there is a possibility that the teachers' and students' responses were controlled by the survey questions. Further, it must be noted that the the majority of teachers stated that they offered instruction in vocabulary, sequencing, and phonemic awareness, all important dimensions of exemplary reading instruction. Like all good reading teachers, they also supplemented their reading programs with trade books, newspapers, magazines, dictionaries, and encyclopedias, and wished for extended amounts of time to teach reading.

The discouraging data associated with this particular inquiry however, must be acknowledged. The survey results send a powerful message to schools of education, school district leaders, and teachers. Since the "very nature of literacy is regularly changing because of new technologies" (Leu, 2000, p. 763), teacher

educators must keep current and provide effective ways to support future teachers as they learn new electronic literacies. In addition, it is imperative that teacher educators determine what teachers might "need to know about learning, reading, and instruction to improve what already may be a reasonable reading program" (Raphael, 1987, in Anders, Hoffman, & Duffy, 2000, p. 721).

The study alerts school district leaders to carefully contemplate what they know about the teaching and learning of literacy. School leaders have considerable power and, unfortunately, they may disregard the complexities of the reading process and dictate that teachers use commercial reading programs that narrowly define reading by focusing solely on phonics and basic skills.

The study unquestionably prompts teachers to take personal responsibility for expanding their knowledge about reading theory and reading instruction. Teachers need to display initiative, creativity, and resourcefulness and progress beyond "one size fits all reading programs that move children through a step-wise process from small parts of language to larger ones, with limited ability to identify individual needs" (Coles, 2001, p. 2). They must be able to clearly communicate their beliefs about teaching reading and discuss how their beliefs align with their practices (Routman, 1999). They need to have access to teaching resources, attend conference presentations, and read professional literature. They must find time to interact within a community of colleagues, discussing and reflecting upon teaching concerns and problems. They need to create personal portfolios that document their teaching, and collect and study student evaluations that will guide their future lessons. They must recognize the benefits of

conducting action research projects to help them determine how their students prefer to learn and in what ways their students learn best. Teachers who engage in these types of professional initiatives are capable of making intelligent, informed decisions about reading instruction that go beyond school system constraints and complement and extend mandated district reading programs.

Author's Notes: 1) The following University of Southern Mississippi graduate Educational Administration students collected the data for this inquiry: Gwen Miller, Tracy Sellers, Jim Hughey, Craig Mackay, Janie Sema, Maria Midgett, Ali Muhammed, and Tori Holloway.

2) It might prove interesting if this study were replicated in various teaching contexts and geographical locations throughout the United States. Readers of this article are encouraged to copy and use the Teacher and Student Survey Questions located in the Appendices. Those who survey teachers and students might consider joining together to present a CRA, NRC, or IRA session and collaborate in authoring a manuscript for publication. Please contact Janet Richards if you decide to conduct a similar study.

References

Alexander, P., & Jetton, T. (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental aspect. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research Volume 111 (pp. 123-139). Mawah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Alvermann, D. (2000). Narrative approaches. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research Volume 111 (pp. 285-310). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Almasi, J. (1995). A new view of discussion. In L. Gambrell and J. Almasi (Eds.), Lively discussions!: Fostering engaged reading (pp. 2-24). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Anders, P., Hoffman, J., & Duffy, G. (2000). Teaching teachers to teach reading: Paradigm shifts, persistent problems, and challenges. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research, Volume 111 (pp. 719-742). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Au, K. (1997). Ownership, literacy achievement, and students of diverse cultural backgrounds. In T. Guthrie and A. Wigfield (Eds.), Reading engagement: Motivating readers through integrated instruction (pp. 168-182). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Au, K. (2001, May). Reading programs. (Published in the Professional Library Column). The Reading Teacher, 54(8), 753-760.

Au, K., & Kawakami, A. 1994). Cultural congruence in instruction. In E. Hollins, J. King, and W. Hayman (Eds.), Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base (pp. 5-23). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Baumann, J., Hoffman, J., Moon, J., & Duffy-Hester, A. (1998). Where are teachers' voices in the phonics/whole language debate? Results from a survey of US elementary teachers. The Reading Teacher, 51, 636-652.

Blachowicz, C., & Ogle, D. (2001). Reading comprehension: Strategies for independent learners. New York: Guilford Press.

Christian-Smith, L. (1993). Gender, popular culture, and curriculum: Adolescent romance novels as gender texts. Curriculum Inquiry, 17(4), 365-406.

Coles, G. (2000). Misreading reading: The bad science that hurts children. Westport, CT: Heinemann.

Coles, G. (2001, Sunday, June 24). Culture watch: Bush's 'scientific' vision: A nation of rote readers. Newsday, New York City, NY.

DeFord, D. (1979). A validation study of an instrument to determine teachers' theoretical orientation to reading instruction (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University). Dissertation Abstracts International. 1980. 40, 4549A (University Microfilms No. 80-00611)

Dionisio, M. (1989). Write? isn't this reading class? The Reading Teacher, 36, 746-749.

Galda, L. & Cullinan, B. (1991). Literature for literacy: What research says about the benefits of using trade books in the classroom. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, and R. Squires (Eds.), Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts (pp. 529-535). New York: Macmillan.

Garcia, G. (2000). Bilingual children's reading. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research Volume 111 (pp. 813-834). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Gay, L. (1997). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application (5th ed.) (pp. 234-239). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gipe, J. (1998). Multiple paths to literacy: Corrective techniques for classroom teachers (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Gipe, J. (2002). Multiple paths to literacy: Corrective techniques for classroom teachers (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative research in education. New York: Academic Press.

Goswami, U. (2000). Phonological and lexical awareness. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research Volume 111 (pp.251-267). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Grant, L., & Fine, G. (1992). Sociology unleashed: Creative directions in classical ethnography. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy, and J. Preissle (Eds.), The handbook of qualitative research in education (pp. 405-446). New York: Academic Press.

Green, J., Dixon, C., Lin, L., Florian, A., & Bradley, M., with Parton, S., Mattern, C., & Bergamo, H. (1994). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In R. Rudell, M. Rudell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed.) (pp. 24-154). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Grossman, P. (1991). What are we talking about anyhow? Subject matter knowledge of secondary English teachers. In J. Brophy (Ed.), Advances in research on teaching, Vol 2: Subject matter knowledge (pp -). Greenwich,, CT: JAI Press.

Guthrie, T., & Also, S. (1997). Designing contexts to increase motivations for reading. Educational Psychologist, 32, 95-107.

Guthrie, J., Schafer, W., Wang, Y., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). Relationships of instruction of reading: An exploration of social, cognitive, and instructional connections. Reading Research Quarterly, 30 (1), 8-15.

Guthrie, J., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research Volume 111 (pp.403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Harste, J., Strickler, D., & Fay, L. (1976). The teacher of reading. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Anaheim, CA. (ERIC reproduction Document Service No. ED 123 552)

Hoffman, J, & Kugle, C. (1981). A study of theoretical orientation to reading and its relationship to teacher verbal feedback during reading instruction. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 304)

Kamil, M, Mosenthal, P. Pearson, P. D., & Barr, R. (Eds.) (2000). Handbook of reading research Volume 111. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 6, 293-323.

Leu, D. (2000). Literacy and technology: Deictic consequences for literacy education in an information age. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research, Volume 111 (pp.743-770). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

McKenna, M., Kear, D., & Elsworth, R (1995). Children's attitudes toward reading: A national survey. Reading Research Quarterly, 30, 934-956.

Monson, D., & Sebesta, S. (1991). Reading preferences. In J. Flood, J. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. Squire (Eds.), Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts (pp. 664-673). New York: Macmillan.

Morrow, L., & Gambrell, L. (2000). Literature-based reading instruction. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), Handbook of reading research Volume 111 (pp.563-586). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Morrow, L., & Smith, J. (1990). The effects of group size on interactive storybook reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 25, 214-231.

Ogle, D. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. The Reading Teacher, 40, 564-570.

Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension be the instruction of? In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.). Handbook of reading research Volume 111 (pp. 545-561). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Raphael, T. (1987). Research on reading: But what can I teach on Monday? In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), Educators' handbook: A research perspective (pp. 26-49). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Richards, J. (1985). Theoretical orientation and first and third grade teachers' reading instruction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans).

Richardson, L. (1997). Poetic representation. In J. Flood, S. Heath., & D. Lapp (Eds.), Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts (pp. 232-238). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed) (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Routman, R. (1999). Conversations: Strategies for teaching, learning, and evaluating. Westport CT: Heinemann.

Rudell, R., Rudell, M., & Singer, H. (1994). Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Ryan, G., & Bernard, H. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin, and E. Lincoln, (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd. ed.). (pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, S. (2001, June, July). An open letter to Reid Lyon. Educational Researcher, 30(5), 26-33.

Turner, J. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 39, 410-441.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J. (1991). Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zancanella, D. (1991). Teachers' reading/Readers teaching: Five teachers personal approaches to literature and their teaching of literature. Research in the Teaching of English, 25, 5-32.

Appendix A

Teacher Survey Questions and Examples of Teachers' Responses

1) What is reading comprehension?

The ability to make sense of the printed page.
When readers can fluently read a passage and be able to explain it in detail.
The ability to understand a passage.
Understanding what you are reading.
When students can tell me the events in a story in which they occur.
When reader understand information in written form.

2) How do you know that students have comprehended what they have read?

Through assessment measures and observations and check lists.
When they can retell a story.
When they can answer questions and tell what the story is about.
By asking questions.
I test them on sequencing, vocabulary words, and sentences from the story.
Okay, Before a child can read words, um, they need to know the sounds of letters which is the most important step in reading. I ask my students question too. I also tape record books for auditory learners.

3) What do you know about multiple literacies?

I don't know a lot. I would think multiple literacies would be that they are technologically literate.
I am not familiar with the term.
Never heard of it.
I think it is using different ways of teaching literacy.
Drama and puppets.
Learning styles. I have studied a great deal about learning styles.

4) How do you teach reading comprehension?

In multiple manners. I don't think there is one way to teach reading comprehension.
By asking questions.
By reading to students, asking them questions about the story (picking it apart).
By asking questions and discussing the story.
I teach vocabulary and sequencing.
Okay, I teach reading comprehension through word play and reading and writing activities. I use flash cards to help them memorize words. I teach them how to blend sounds in words. I use K-W-L.

5) How do you assess students' reading comprehension?

I ask them to retell what they have read.
We answered that question already...through formal and informal ways.
By asking questions and having students answer in a verbal and written form.

I test them on vocabulary in each story and the sequencing of events. I use the discussion questions at the end of the stories.
By observation.
An easy one.. I use oral questioning and written questions.

6) How do you teach reading to students who are experiencing difficulties?

I pair students who are having difficulties with good readers.
Offering more opportunities for oral reading and asking parents to limit television and have kids read more at home.
I teach them to use context clues and to reread.
I help them catch up by teaching them sounds.
Oh boy! Before a child can read words, they need to know the sounds of letters. hearing and saying sounds prepares children to read.
I teach them vocabulary, predicting, word meanings and we do silent reading.

7) How do you teach reading to gifted readers?

I give them independent work and difficult activities.
Have them act out stories, do projects, produce artwork about stories, do research.
I set high expectations and get them to set their own high expectations.
I use the same techniques. I just give them more activities.
I get them to use their personal experiences and interests to dévelop their own creative writing, present plays, do projects, etc.
I give gifted readers extra creative writing and introduce them to a variety of literary work. I have them apply critical thinking skills whenever possible.

8) Do you follow a specific reading program? What do you like or dislike about the program?

No.
We follow the Open Court program and I love it. I like the way it systematically teachers the sounds and spellings of the English Language and the rules that apply.
I don't like it...not enough meat in it.
Open Court, but I would like to see more whole language.
Yes, Project Read which has phonology, written expression, story form, and report form, and the like.
There is not a specific reading program in my room.

9) What types of literature do you use in addition to your reading program materials?

I use short stories, nonfiction, newspapers, and magazines.
Caldecott, and other award winners.
We read everything and anything the students bring in.
Scholastic Books.
My classroom has a library that students are free to borrow from anytime. My bulletin boards also

have reading material. I am hoping to incorporate magazines and newspapers soon.
I use class sets, magazines, newspapers, teacher-created materials, and student created materials.

10) Are you a member of the International Reading Association?

No.
Yes, I belong.
No., but I belong to the Fort Marapas Reading Association.
No. I have in the past, but not right now. It gave me the opportunity to work and gain insight and ideas from others on the field.
No.
No.

11) Are you a member of other professional organizations?

No.
No.
No.
No.
No.
No.

12) If you could teach reading any way you chose, how would you teach it and why?

I would use small group instruction and whole class reading.
I would teach it just the way I am doing now, only concentrating more on reading and less on other subjects.
I would teach it in the same way, but allow more time for reading.
I like Open Court.
I'm able to teach reading the way I want to teach it as long as I pretty much follow the Project Read guidelines. We use trade books too
With unlimited resources.

Appendix B

Student Survey Questions and Examples of Students' Responses

1) What do you think reading is?

Boring

Fun

A subject

Something that people do for fun. They can acquire knowledge from reading

You look at a book and read the words and you can picture what you are reading.

Boring

2) How do you know when you have comprehended what you have read?

I don't know...oh I can retell the stories.

I can explain it if I understood it.

You just know.

When I can recite whatever I have read in my own words

If you can answer questions about it.

I can tell others what I have read.

3) What do you know about computers?

They can help you.

I get on the computer and type at my house. You can learn from them.

I know how to play games, use the Internet, Microsoft Word and AOL. I can learn from the computer.

I know how to use most of the software and can use them to look up information.

You can do all kinds of stuff on them. You can write, do sketches, look up information, and take tests on them.

They can help you a lot. You can do your homework a lot faster.

4) What do you do when you don't understand what you have read?

I ask the teacher.

I ask the teacher.

I go back and reread it.

I ask somebody.

I ask the teacher.

I read it again or I get someone else to read it to me.

Ask the teacher and someone to help you.

5) How does your teacher figure out how well you read?

She asks us questions and if we answer them right she knows how well we can read.

I tell her and I take a test.

She brings it up. She watches you sometimes. She listens. She gives you a test.

She asks me questions about what I have read.

We take the STAR reading tests and that tells us what grade we read on.

She listens to you and she can tell if you go ask her questions;

6) Do you think you're a good reader?

Yes.

Yes because I read.

A good reader because whenever she gives us a test I always make a hundred. Sometimes I don't but I still think I am a good reader.

Yes because most of my books I can summarize.

Yes I am good. I can read in front of the whole class without getting embarrassed.

Pretty good because I can say alot of big words and I can read pretty fast.

7) Does your teacher have reading groups or does she teach the whole class at one time?

She teachers the whole class at once.

We have groups.

She teaches the whole class at once. Sometimes she lets us get in groups.

We sometimes have centers and read together but most of the time we are taught whole class.

The whole class.

The whole class.

8) What books do you learn to read from in class?

We have chapter books, books on the shelf, and our text book.

Text books.

Easy books

Text books and trade books.

Accelerated Readers and text books.

Chapter books and we are writing one now and we are going to put it on the computer.

9) What other types of books do you read in your classroom?

We don't have any other kinds.

Accelerated Reader books, trade books, library books.

Accelerated Reader books.

The newspaper and AR (Accelerated Reader).

Trade book we have some...but we don't read out of them.

I don't know.

10) Do you have any reading clubs in your school?

No.

No.

No.

No.

Sometimes we have Readathon where we bring our sleeping bags and we read on the floor for an hour and a half.

No

12) If your teacher could teach reading anyway that you wanted, how would you want her to teach it?

Play the books on a tape.

Just let me read what I want.

Let me read until I get it. I just read and read and read until I get it. She would read it first then I would read it.

I pretty much like the way she is doing it now. We read the story and listen to the tape. Then, we get in groups and answer questions together and then she goes over them with us. I would like her to use the computer more.

A game.

Just the way we do now, and plays, and puppets. We could do music.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

053363

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: What Do Teachers and Their Students Think and Know about Reading?: An Exploratory Study	
Author(s): Janet C. Richards	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

↑

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

↑

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

↑

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Janet C Richards	Printed Name/Position/Title: Professor / Janet C. Richards	
Organization/Address: University of Southern Mississippi 730 E. Beach Blvd. Long Beach, MS 39560	Telephone: 228 255 7642	FAX: 228 255 5557
	E-Mail Address: jcrichsm@aol.com	Date

(over)